

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Latesha Watson,

Plaintiff

v.

City of Henderson, et al.,

Defendants

Case No. 2:20-cv-01761-CDS-CLB<sup>1</sup>

**Order Rejecting Proposed  
Joint Pretrial Order**

[ECF No. 231]

The parties' proposed joint pretrial order (ECF No. 231) is rejected because it violates Local Rules 16-3 and 16-4.

The parties have titled section IV as "disputed facts." ECF No. 231 at 4-9. However, the local rules require that the joint pretrial order include "[a] statement of all *uncontested* facts deemed material in the action." LR 16-3(b)(3) (emphasis added). Under LR 16-4, that section should provide facts that "will *not be contested* at trial by evidence to the contrary" (emphasis added).

Second, based on the consecutive Bates numbering, Watson appears to list every document produced in this case for her trial exhibits. ECF No. 231 at 17-28. LR 16-3(b)(8) requires parties to list the "exhibits that will be offered in evidence by the parties at the trial." Listing every document with no attempt to cull does not satisfy this rule. While the parties are not required to list only those exhibits that they are sure to offer at trial, they cannot simply list

---

<sup>1</sup> All documents must bear the correct case number 2:20-cv-01761-CDS-CLB. ECF No. 219. This matter was administratively reassigned to me in 2022. ECF No. 128. On July 7, 2022, Cook was advised by the clerk to correct the case number before filing documents (ECF No. 133), yet counsel fails to do so. *See e.g.*, ECF Nos. 135, 223, 232, 233. Counsel is again advised to correct the case number before filing any documents in the future as all documents must bear the correct case number: 2:20-cv-01761-CDS-CLB. ECF No. 219.

1 every document identified in discovery. The purpose behind the joint pretrial order is to  
2 streamline trial preparation and the presentation of evidence.

3 In addition, the proposed joint pretrial is rejected because it does not include section X  
4 to provide the estimated number of trial days, nor does it contain a section for “action by the  
5 court” as required under Local Rule 16-4.

6 **Conclusion**

7 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the parties’ proposed joint pretrial order [ECF No.  
8 231] is REJECTED. The parties must confer and submit a second proposed joint pretrial order  
9 by August 22, 2024.

10 Dated: August 8, 2024

11   
12 Cristina D. Silva  
13 United States District Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26